UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,403	12/21/2001	Lawrence R. Miller	36287-02001	2495

27171 7590 02/28/2008

MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY
1 CHASE MANHATTAN PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10005-1413

EXAMINER	
PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/026,403	MILLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICHAEL PYZOCHA	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 January 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6,8-20,23,25 and 26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6,8-20,23,25 and 26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/31/07*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-20, 23, 25, and 26 are pending.

2. Amendment filed 01/04/2008 has been received and considered.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The IDS filed 10/31/2007 has been received. Due to the vast number of references cited on the IDS only a cursory consideration of these documents has been conducted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 9-19, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Squier et al. (US 7188181).

As per claims 1, 9-13, 17, and 23, Squier et al. discloses inputting at a first system that grants session credentials

based on successful authentication, a request from a client to access a protected resource on the first system, the protected resource on the first system being accessible by the client only after successful authentication of the client at the first system (see column 5 lines 54-63); determining at the first system that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by the first system (see column 5 line 64 through column 6 line 4); retrieving, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information being retrieved from the client, the information corresponding to a session credential for the second system, the second system grants session credentials based on successful authentication at the second system and includes protected resources on the second system that is accessible by the client, the protected resource on the second system being accessible by the client only after successful authentication of the client at the second system (see column 6 lines 4-15) the first system presenting at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; the first system inputting a determination from the second system that the client has a valid session credential with the second system; and the first system effecting successful authentication to the client so as to grant access to the protected resource on the first system, to the client based

on the determination from the second system that the client has a valid session credential with the second system (see column 6 line 41 through column 7 line 5 see also figure 2) the first system inputting information from the second system and in response the first system outputting to the second system a determination that the first system has a valid session credential for the client at the first system; and the second system effecting successful authentication so as to grant access to the further protected resource on the second system to the client based on the determination from the first system that the client has a valid session credential with the first system (see column 6 lines 41-56 and column 8 lines 29-63 and column 9 lines 2-4).

As per claim 14, Squier et al. discloses granting a session credential to the client by the first system, after determining that the client has a valid session credential granted by the second system (see column 6 lines 57-62).

As per claim 15, Squier et al. discloses maintaining the client session credential granted by the second system (see column 6 lies 57-64).

As per claims 16 and 19, Squier et al. discloses associating session credentials for the first system and the second system with the client (see column 6 lines 57-64).

As per claim 18 Squier et al. discloses granting the client session credentials for the first system (see column 6 lines 57-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4, 6, 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Squier et al. in view of Howard et al. (US 6584505).

As per claims 1 and 20, Squier et al. discloses inputting at a first system that grants session credentials based on successful authentication, a request from a client to access a protected resource on the first system, the protected resource on the first system being accessible by the client only after successful authentication of the client at the first system (see column 5 lines 54-63); determining at the first system that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by the

first system (see column 5 line 64 through column 6 line 4); retrieving, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information being retrieved from the client, the information corresponding to a session credential for the second system, the second system grants session credentials based on successful authentication at the second system and includes protected resources on the second system that is accessible by the client, the protected resource on the second system being accessible by the client only after successful authentication of the client at the second system (see column 6 lines 4-15) the first system presenting at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; the first system inputting a determination from the second system that the client has a valid session credential with the second system; and the first system effecting successful authentication to the client so as to grant access to the protected resource on the first system, to the client based on the determination from the second system that the client has a valid session credential with the second system (see column 6 line 41 through column 7 line 5 see also figure 2).

Squier et al. fails to discloses directing the client to the first system to establish a session credential based on successful authentication at the first system, after determining

that the client does not have a valid session credential granted by the second system.

However, Howard et al. teaches such redirection (see column 6 lines 51-52 and column 8 lines 54-57).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to redirect the client to a different server upon failed authentication.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to authenticate to a known server (see Howard et al. column 7 lines 52-65).

As per claim 2, the modified Squier et al. and Howard et al. system discloses granting a session credential to the client by the first system, after determining that the client has a valid session credential granted by the second system (see Squier et al. column 6 lines 57-62).

As per claim 3, the modified Squier et al. and Howard et al. system discloses sending a session token to the client, the token corresponding to a session credential granted by the first system (see Squier et al. column 6 lines 57-62).

As per claim 4, the modified Squier et al. and Howard et al. system discloses a method comprising directing the client to the second system to establish a session credential based on successful authentication at the second system, after

determining that the client does not have a valid session credential granted by the second system (see Squier et al. column 6 lines 30-40).

As per claim 6, the modified Squier et al. and Howard et al. system discloses maintaining the client session credential granted by the second system (see Squier et al. column 6 lies 57-64).

As per claim 8, the modified Squier et al. and Howard et al. system discloses retrieving information from the session token held by the client comprises: sending a query to the client from the first system, the query including identification as originating from a domain name corresponding to the second system; and receiving a response to the query (see Howard column 8, lines 8-11).

8. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Squier et al. as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of Marks et al. (US 20010054059).

As per claims 25 and 26 Squier et al. fails to disclose that the protected resource is pay-per-use or subscription content.

However, Marks et al. teaches content of this type (see paragraph [0028]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to protect pay-per-use and subscription content using the Squier et al. system.

Motivation to do so would have been that this type of content costs money and protecting them prevents free use of the content.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 01/04/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Squier fails to teach the limitations added to, for example, claim 23 and Howard fails to teach the limitations of claim 5 (now incorporated into claim 1).

With respect to Applicant's argument that Squier fails to disclose the first system inputting information from the second system and in response the first system outputting to the second system a determination that the first system has a valid session credential for the client at the first system; and the second system effecting successful authentication so as to grant access to the further protected resource on the second system to the client based on the determination from the first system that the client has a valid session credential with the first system, in step 216 of Figure 2B the origin server determines whether it

can authenticate a session identifier provided by the destination server. This process is further described with respect to Figure 5 where the destination sends the session identifier to the origin server and the origin server determines if it is valid and sends the appropriate data whether it is valid (i.e. authenticated). If the session identifier is authenticated by the origin server the destination server issues a session identifier for the client to use on the destination server. Therefore, Squier discloses the each and every limitation of claim 23.

With respect to Applicant's argument that Howard fails to disclose the directing step of claim 1, Examiner would first like to note that the first recitation of the "second system" as noted by Applicant (see page 18 of the response) was merely a typographical error and has been corrected above. Furthermore, Howard teaches directing the client to the first system to establish a session credential based on successful authentication at the first system, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential granted by the second system in Figures 4 and 5 and the corresponding description in the specification. Specifically, Howard teaches the affiliate server (i.e. second system) determining that the user is not authenticated and redirecting the user to the

authentication server (i.e. the first system)(see numeral 202). Therefore, Howard teaches directing the client to the first system to establish a session credential based on successful authentication at the first system, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential granted by the second system and the combination is proper.

Applicant's argument that Marks fails to cure the deficiencies of Squier is moot in view of the above response.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PYZOCHA whose telephone number is (571)272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MJP

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2137